

APPROXIMATIONS BY MAXIMAL COHEN–MACAULAY MODULES

HENRIK HOLM

ABSTRACT. Auslander and Buchweitz have proved that every finitely generated module over a Cohen–Macaulay (CM) ring with a dualizing module admits a so-called maximal CM approximation. In terms of relative homological algebra, this means that every finitely generated module has a special maximal CM precover. In this paper, we prove the existence of special maximal CM preenvelopes and, in the case where the ground ring is henselian, of maximal CM envelopes. We also characterize the rings over which every finitely generated module has a maximal CM envelope with the unique lifting property. Finally, we show that cosyzygies with respect to the class of maximal CM modules must eventually be maximal CM, and we compute some examples.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a commutative noetherian local Cohen–Macaulay (CM) ring with a dualizing module Ω and denote by MCM the class of maximal CM R -modules. Auslander and Buchweitz construct in [1, Thm. A] a *maximal CM approximation* for every finitely generated R -module M , that is, a short exact sequence,

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\pi} M \longrightarrow 0$$

where X belongs to MCM and I has finite injective dimension. By a result of Ischebeck [11] one has $\text{Ext}_R^1(Y, I) = 0$ for all Y in MCM , so in terms of relative homological algebra, this means that the homomorphism $\pi: X \twoheadrightarrow M$ is a *special MCM-precover* of M . A result of Takahashi [13, Cor. 2.5] shows that if R is henselian (for example, if R is complete), then every MCM-precover can be “refined” to an MCM-cover. This result of Takahashi follows from Prop. 2.4 in *loc. cit.*, which the author contributes to Yoshino [17, Lem. 2.2] (written in Japanese). We summarize these results in the following theorem.

Theorem (Auslander and Buchweitz [1], Takahashi [13], and Yoshino [17]).

- (a) *Every finitely generated R -module has a special MCM-precover (also called a special right MCM-approximation).*
- (b) *If R is henselian, then every finitely generated R -module has an MCM-cover (also called a minimal right MCM-approximation).*

This paper is concerned with the existence and the construction of special MCM-preenvelopes and MCM-envelopes of finitely generated modules. Our first main result, which is proved in Section 3, is the following “dual” of the theorem above.

Theorem A. *The following assertions hold.*

- (a) *Every finitely generated R -module M has a special MCM-preenvelope (also called a special left MCM-approximation).*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13C14; 13D05.

Key words and phrases. Cosyzygy; envelope; maximal Cohen–Macaulay module; special preenvelope; unique lifting property.

- (b) If R is henselian, then every finitely generated R -module has an MCM-envelope (also called a minimal left MCM-approximation).

Moreover, every special MCM-preenvelope, in particular, every MCM-envelope $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ of a finitely generated R -module M has the property that $\text{Hom}_R(\text{Coker } \mu, \Omega)$ has finite injective dimension.

We mention that [9, Thm. C] shows the existence of (non-special!) MCM-preenvelopes, but its proof is not constructive: It is a consequence of an abstract result by Crawley-Boevey [5, Thm. (4.2)] combined with the fact—also proved in [9]—that the direct limit closure of MCM is closed under products. Theorem A above is not only stronger than [9, Thm. C]; our proof—which is modelled on that of [10, Thm. 1.6]—also shows how (special) MCM-(pre)envelopes can be constructed from (special) MCM-(pre)covers.

In Section 4 we compute the MCM-envelope of some specific modules. In Section 5 we turn our attention to MCM-envelopes with the *unique lifting property*, and we characterize the rings over which every finitely generated module admits such an envelope:

Theorem B. *The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *For every finitely generated R -module M , the module $\text{Hom}_R(M, \Omega)$ is maximal CM.*
- (ii) *The Krull dimension of R is ≤ 2 .*
- (iii) *The inclusion functor $\text{MCM} \hookrightarrow \text{mod}$ has a left adjoint.*
- (iv) *Every finitely generated R -module has an MCM-envelope with the unique lifting property.*

From a homological point of view, maximal CM modules are interesting because every module can be finitely resolved by such modules. More precisely, if d denotes the Krull dimension of the CM ring R , and if M is any finitely generated R -module with a resolution

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_d \rightarrow X_{d-1} \rightarrow X_{d-2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

by finitely generated free R -modules X_0, X_1, \dots , then the n^{th} syzygy of M , i.e. the module $\text{Syz}_n(M) = \text{Ker}(X_{n-1} \rightarrow X_{n-2})$, is maximal CM for every $n \geq d$. Actually, the same conclusion holds if X_0, X_1, \dots are just assumed to be maximal CM (but not necessarily free); this well-known fact follows from the behaviour of depth in short exact sequences; see Bruns and Herzog [3, Prop. 1.2.9] or Lemma 2.4. Given a finitely generated R -module M , one can *not* always construct an exact sequence

$$(*) \quad 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow X^0 \rightarrow X^1 \rightarrow \cdots$$

where X^0, X^1, \dots are maximal CM; however, there is a canonical way to construct a *complex* of the form $(*)$. Theorem A guarantees the existence of MCM-preenvelopes, which makes the following construction possible: Take an MCM-preenvelope $\mu^0: M \rightarrow X^0$ of M and set $C^1 = \text{Coker } \mu^0$; take an MCM-preenvelope $\mu^1: C^1 \rightarrow X^1$ of C^1 and set $C^2 = \text{Coker } \mu^1$; etc. The hereby constructed complex $(*)$ —which is called a *proper MCM-coresolution* or an *MCM-resolvent* of M —is not necessarily exact, but it becomes exact if one applies the functor $\text{Hom}_R(-, Y)$ to it for any Y in MCM. The module $C^n = \text{Coker}(X^{n-2} \rightarrow X^{n-1})$ is called the n^{th} *cosyzygy of M with respect to MCM*, and it is denoted by $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^n(M)$. In Section 6 we prove that such cosyzygies must eventually be maximal CM:

Theorem C. *Let M be a finitely generated R -module. For every $n \geq d$ the n^{th} cosyzygy, $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^n(M)$, of M with respect to MCM is maximal CM.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Setup. Throughout, (R, \mathfrak{m}, k) is a commutative noetherian local CM ring of Krull dimension d . It is assumed that R has a dualizing (or canonical) module Ω .

Let M be a finitely generated R -module. The *depth* of M is the number

$$\text{depth}_R M = \inf\{i \mid \text{Ext}_R^i(k, M) \neq 0\} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\};$$

see [3, Def. 1.2.6 and 1.2.7]. If $M \neq 0$, then $\text{depth}_R M$ is the common length of a maximal M -regular sequence (in \mathfrak{m}). The depth can also be computed from the dualizing module:

$$\text{depth}_R M = d - \sup\{i \mid \text{Ext}_R^i(M, \Omega) \neq 0\};$$

see [3, Cor. 3.5.11]. One calls M for *maximal CM* if $\text{depth}_R M \geq d$, that is, $\text{Ext}_R^i(M, \Omega) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. The category of all such R -modules is denoted by MCM . The category of all finitely generated R -modules is denoted by mod .

We recall a few notions from relative homological algebra.

2.2 Definition. Let \mathcal{A} be a full subcategory of an abelian category \mathcal{M} (e.g. $\mathcal{M} = \text{mod}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \text{MCM}$), and let M be an object in \mathcal{M} . Following Enochs and Jenda [7, Def. 5.1.1], a morphism $\pi: A \rightarrow M$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is called an \mathcal{A} -*precover* (or a *right \mathcal{A} -approximation*) of M if every other morphism $\pi': A' \rightarrow M$ with $A' \in \mathcal{A}$ factors through π , as illustrated below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & A' & \\ & \downarrow \pi' & \\ A & \xrightarrow{\pi} & M \end{array}$$

A *special \mathcal{A} -precover* (or a *special right \mathcal{A} -approximation*) is an \mathcal{A} -precover $\pi: A \rightarrow M$ such that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(A', \text{Ker} \pi) = 0$ for every $A' \in \mathcal{A}$. An \mathcal{A} -*cover* (or a *minimal right \mathcal{A} -approximation*) is an \mathcal{A} -precover π with the property that every endomorphism φ of A that satisfies $\pi\varphi = \pi$ is an automorphism.

The notions of \mathcal{A} -*preenvelope* (or *left \mathcal{A} -approximation*), *special \mathcal{A} -preenvelope* (or *special left \mathcal{A} -approximation*), and \mathcal{A} -*envelope* (or *minimal left \mathcal{A} -approximation*) are categorically dual to the notions defined above.

By definition, a special \mathcal{A} -precover/preenvelope is also an (ordinary) \mathcal{A} -precover/preenvelope. If \mathcal{A} is closed under extensions in \mathcal{M} , then every \mathcal{A} -cover/envelope is a special \mathcal{A} -precover/preenvelope; this is the content of Wakamatsu's lemma¹.

2.3. It is well-known that the dualizing module Ω gives rise to a duality on the category of maximal CM modules; more precisely, there is an equivalence of categories:

$$\text{MCM} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(-, \Omega)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Hom}_R(-, \Omega)} \end{array} \text{MCM}^{\text{op}}.$$

We use the shorthand notation $(-)^{\dagger}$ for the functor $\text{Hom}_R(-, \Omega)$. For any finitely generated R -module M there is a canonical homomorphism $\delta_M: M \rightarrow M^{\dagger\dagger}$, called the *biduality homomorphism*, which is natural in M . Because of the equivalence above, δ_M is an isomorphism if M belongs to MCM ; cf. [3, Thm. 3.3.10].

We will need the following result about depth; it is folklore and easily proved².

¹ Wakamatsu's lemma is implicitly in [15] by Wakamatsu. It is explicitly stated in Auslander and Reiten [2, lem. 1.3], but without a proof. It is stated and proved in Xu [16, lem. 2.1.1 and 2.1.2].

² One way to prove Lemma 2.4 is by induction on m , using the behaviour of depth on short exact sequences recorded in Bruns and Herzog [3, Prop. 1.2.9].

2.4 Lemma. Let $m \geq 0$ be an integer and let $0 \rightarrow K_m \rightarrow X_{m-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of finitely generated R -modules. If X_0, \dots, X_{m-1} are maximal CM, then one has $\text{depth}_R K_m \geq \min\{d, \text{depth}_R M + m\}$. In particular, if $m \geq d$ then the R -module K_m is maximal CM. \square

3. SPECIAL MCM-PREENVELOPES AND MCM-ENVELOPES

In this section, we prove Theorem A from the Introduction. Our proof follows that of [10, Thm. 1.6] with some adjustments.

3.1 Lemma. For every R -module M , the composition $M^\dagger \xrightarrow{\delta_{M^\dagger}} M^{\dagger\dagger\dagger} \xrightarrow{\delta_M^\dagger} M^\dagger$ is the identity map on M^\dagger .

Proof. Let φ be an arbitrary element in $M^\dagger = \text{Hom}_R(M, \Omega)$. We must show that the element $(\delta_M^\dagger \circ \delta_{M^\dagger})(\varphi) = \delta_{M^\dagger}(\varphi) \circ \delta_M$ is nothing but φ , that is, we must prove that for every $x \in M$ one has $(\delta_{M^\dagger}(\varphi) \circ \delta_M)(x) = \varphi(x)$. The definitions yield

$$(\delta_{M^\dagger}(\varphi) \circ \delta_M)(x) = \delta_{M^\dagger}(\varphi)(\delta_M(x)) = \delta_M(x)(\varphi) = \varphi(x). \quad \square$$

3.2 Lemma. For every finitely generated R -module M , the next conditions are equivalent.

- (i) $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega) = 0$ and $\text{Ext}_R^1(X, M^\dagger) = 0$ for every $X \in \text{MCM}$.
- (ii) $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, Y) = 0$ for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$.

Proof. (i) \implies (ii): Assume (i). Given any $Y \in \text{MCM}$ we must argue that $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, Y) = 0$, i.e. that every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\alpha} E \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ splits. As $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega) = 0$, the functor $(-)^{\dagger}$ leaves this sequence exact; in fact, the induced short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M^\dagger \longrightarrow E^\dagger \xrightarrow{\alpha^\dagger} Y^\dagger \longrightarrow 0$$

splits as Y^\dagger belongs to MCM and hence $\text{Ext}_R^1(Y^\dagger, M^\dagger) = 0$ by assumption. Let $\beta: Y^\dagger \rightarrow E^\dagger$ be a right inverse of α^\dagger . Then $\delta_Y^{-1}\beta^\dagger\delta_E: E \rightarrow Y$ is a left inverse of α since one has

$$\delta_Y^{-1}\beta^\dagger\delta_E\alpha = \delta_Y^{-1}\beta^\dagger\alpha^{\dagger\dagger}\delta_Y = \delta_Y^{-1}(\alpha^\dagger\beta)^\dagger\delta_Y = \delta_Y^{-1}1_{Y^{\dagger\dagger}}\delta_Y = 1_Y.$$

(ii) \implies (i): Assume (ii). This assumption implies that $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega) = 0$ since $\Omega \in \text{MCM}$. Given $X \in \text{MCM}$ we must show that $\text{Ext}_R^1(X, M^\dagger) = 0$, i.e. that every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M^\dagger \xrightarrow{\alpha} E \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$ splits. Since X is in MCM we have, in particular, $\text{Ext}_R^1(X, \Omega) = 0$, so application of the functor $(-)^{\dagger}$ yields another short exact sequence:

$$(*) \quad 0 \longrightarrow X^\dagger \longrightarrow E^\dagger \xrightarrow{\alpha^\dagger} M^{\dagger\dagger} \longrightarrow 0.$$

As X^\dagger belongs to MCM we have $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, X^\dagger) = 0$, so the functor $\text{Hom}_R(M, -)$ leaves the sequence $(*)$ exact. Surjectivity of $\text{Hom}_R(M, \alpha^\dagger)$ yields a homomorphism $\beta: M \rightarrow E^\dagger$ with $\alpha^\dagger\beta = \delta_M$. It follows that $\beta^\dagger\delta_E: E \rightarrow M^\dagger$ is a left inverse of α since one has

$$\beta^\dagger\delta_E\alpha = \beta^\dagger\alpha^{\dagger\dagger}\delta_{M^\dagger} = (\alpha^\dagger\beta)^\dagger\delta_{M^\dagger} = \delta_M^\dagger\delta_{M^\dagger} = 1_{M^\dagger},$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 3.1. \square

Proof of Theorem A. We begin by proving the last assertion in the theorem. Let $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ be any special MCM-preenvelope of M . By assumption, we have $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, Y) = 0$ for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$, so Lemma 3.2 implies that $\text{Ext}_R^1(Z, (\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger) = 0$ for every $Z \in \text{MCM}$. By Auslander and Buchweitz [1, Thm. A], we can take a *hull of finite injective dimension* for the finitely generated module $(\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger$, that is, a short exact sequence,

$$0 \longrightarrow (\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow 0,$$

where I has finite injective dimension and Z is maximal CM. As $\text{Ext}_R^1(Z, (\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger) = 0$, this sequence splits, and $(\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger$ is therefore a direct summand in I . Since I has finite injective dimension, so has $(\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger$.

To prove parts (a) and (b), let M be a finitely generated R -module and let $\pi: Z \rightarrow M^\dagger$ be a homomorphism with $Z \in \text{MCM}$. We will show that if π is a special MCM-precover, respectively, an MCM-cover³, of M^\dagger then the homomorphism

$$\mu := \pi^\dagger \delta_M: M \longrightarrow Z^\dagger$$

is a special MCM-preenvelope, respectively, an MCM-envelope, of M .

First assume that π is a special MCM-precover. We begin by proving that μ is an MCM-preenvelope. Note that Z^\dagger is in MCM by 2.3. We must show that $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, Y)$ is surjective for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$. By 2.3 every such Y has the form $Y \cong X^\dagger$ for some $X \in \text{MCM}$ (namely for $X = Y^\dagger$), so it suffices to show that $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, X^\dagger)$ is surjective for every $X \in \text{MCM}$. By definition of μ , the homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, X^\dagger)$ is the composition of the maps

$$(*) \quad \text{Hom}_R(Z^\dagger, X^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(\pi^\dagger, X^\dagger)} \text{Hom}_R(M^{\dagger\dagger}, X^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(\delta_M, X^\dagger)} \text{Hom}_R(M, X^\dagger).$$

Via the “swap” isomorphism, see Christensen [4, (A.2.9)], the homomorphisms in $(*)$ are identified with the ones in the top row of the following diagram:

$$(**) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_R(X, Z^{\dagger\dagger}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(X, \pi^{\dagger\dagger})} & \text{Hom}_R(X, M^{\dagger\dagger\dagger}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(X, \delta_M^\dagger)} & \text{Hom}_R(X, M^\dagger) \\ \uparrow \cong & & \uparrow & & \nearrow \\ \text{Hom}_R(X, \delta_Z) & & \text{Hom}_R(X, \delta_{M^\dagger}) & & \\ \text{Hom}_R(X, Z) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(X, \pi)} & \text{Hom}_R(X, M^\dagger) & & \end{array}$$

The left square in $(**)$ is commutative since the biduality homomorphism δ is natural, and the right triangle in $(**)$ is commutative by Lemma 3.1. The map δ_Z is an isomorphism since Z is in MCM; and $\text{Hom}_R(X, \pi)$ is surjective as π is an MCM-precover and $X \in \text{MCM}$. It follows that the composition of the maps in the top row of $(**)$, and therefore also the map $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, X^\dagger)$, is surjective. Thus, μ is an MCM-preenvelope.

To see that μ is a special MCM-preenvelope, we must prove that $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, Y) = 0$ for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$. As the functor $(-)^\dagger$ is left exact, $(\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger$ is isomorphic to $\text{Ker}(\mu^\dagger)$. By definition we have $\mu^\dagger = \delta_M^\dagger \pi^{\dagger\dagger}$, and hence μ^\dagger fits into the commutative diagram:

$$(***) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z^{\dagger\dagger} & \xrightarrow{\mu^\dagger} & M^\dagger \\ \parallel & & \uparrow \delta_M^\dagger \\ Z^{\dagger\dagger} & \xrightarrow{\pi^{\dagger\dagger}} & M^{\dagger\dagger\dagger} \\ \uparrow \delta_Z \cong & & \uparrow \delta_{M^\dagger} \\ Z & \xrightarrow{\pi} & M^\dagger \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 1_{M^\dagger} \end{array} \quad (\text{By Lemma 3.1})$$

It follows that μ^\dagger and π are isomorphic maps, and hence they also have isomorphic kernels, that is, $\text{Ker}(\mu^\dagger) \cong \text{Ker } \pi$. It follows that $(\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger \cong \text{Ker } \pi$. Since π is a special MCM-precover, we now have

$$\text{Ext}_R^1(X, (\text{Coker } \mu)^\dagger) \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(X, \text{Ker } \pi) = 0$$

³ By the theorem of Auslander and Buchweitz, Takahashi, and Yoshino mentioned in the Introduction, special MCM-precovers always exist, and MCM-covers exist if R is henselian

for every $X \in \text{MCM}$. Thus, to see that $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, Y) = 0$ for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$, it suffices by Lemma 3.2 to prove that $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, \Omega) = 0$. To this end, set $X = Z^\dagger \in \text{MCM}$ and consider the factorization of $\mu: M \rightarrow Z^\dagger = X$ given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X \\ & \searrow \mu_0 \quad \nearrow \iota & \\ & \text{Im } \mu & \end{array}$$

where μ_0 is the corestriction of μ to its image and ι is the inclusion map. As μ_0 is surjective and $(-)^{\dagger}$ is left exact, the map μ_0^{\dagger} is injective. As $\Omega \in \text{MCM}$ and μ is an MCM-preenvelope, the map $\mu^{\dagger} = \text{Hom}_R(\mu, \Omega)$ is surjective; and hence so is μ_0^{\dagger} since $\mu^{\dagger} = \mu_0^{\dagger} \iota^{\dagger}$. Thus, μ_0^{\dagger} is an isomorphism. Hence ι^{\dagger} and μ^{\dagger} are isomorphic maps, and since μ^{\dagger} is surjective, so is ι^{\dagger} . Thus, application of $(-)^{\dagger}$ to $0 \rightarrow \text{Im } \mu \xrightarrow{\iota} X \rightarrow \text{Coker } \mu \rightarrow 0$ yields an exact sequence,

$$X^{\dagger} \xrightarrow{\iota^{\dagger}} (\text{Im } \mu)^{\dagger} \xrightarrow{0} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, \Omega) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(X, \Omega) = 0,$$

which forces $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Coker } \mu, \Omega) = 0$, as desired.

Finally, assume that π is an MCM-cover. We show that $\mu = \pi^{\dagger} \delta_M$ is an MCM-envelope. We have already seen that μ is an MCM-preenvelope. To show that it is an envelope, let φ be an endomorphism of Z^{\dagger} with $\varphi \mu = \mu$. It follows that $\mu^{\dagger} \varphi^{\dagger} = \mu^{\dagger}$. The diagram (***) shows that $\mu^{\dagger} \delta_Z = \pi$, and thus $\pi(\delta_Z^{-1} \varphi^{\dagger} \delta_Z) = \mu^{\dagger} \varphi^{\dagger} \delta_Z = \mu^{\dagger} \delta_Z = \pi$. As π is an MCM-cover, we conclude that $\delta_Z^{-1} \varphi^{\dagger} \delta_Z$, and therefore also φ^{\dagger} , is an automorphism. It follows that $\varphi^{\dagger \dagger}$ is an automorphism of $Z^{\dagger \dagger}$, and finally that $\varphi = \delta_{Z^{\dagger}}^{-1} \varphi^{\dagger \dagger} \delta_{Z^{\dagger}}$ is an automorphism of Z^{\dagger} . \square

4. EXAMPLES

We compute the MCM-envelope of some specific modules. We begin with a characterization of modules with trivial MCM-envelope.

4.1 Proposition. *For a finitely generated R -module M , one has $\dim_R M < d$ if and only if the zero map $M \rightarrow 0$ is an MCM-envelope of M .*

Proof. If $\dim_R M < d$ then [3, Cor. 3.5.11(a)] shows that $\text{Hom}_R(M, \Omega) = 0$. It follows that every homomorphism $\varphi: M \rightarrow X$ with $X \in \text{MCM}$ is zero. Indeed, since Ω cogenerates the category MCM, there exists a monomorphism $\iota: X \rightarrow \Omega^n$ for some natural number n . As $\text{Hom}_R(M, \Omega) = 0$, the homomorphism $\iota \varphi: M \rightarrow \Omega^n$ must be zero, and thus $\varphi = 0$ since ι is injective. Since every homomorphism from M to a maximal CM module is zero, the zero map $M \rightarrow 0$ is an MCM-envelope of M .

Conversely, if $M \rightarrow 0$ is an MCM-(pre)envelope then, since Ω is in MCM, every homomorphism $\varphi: M \rightarrow \Omega$ factors through 0, and hence $\varphi = 0$. Thus $\text{Hom}_R(M, \Omega) = 0$, and it follows from [3, Cor. 3.5.11(b)] that one can not have $\dim_R M = d$; so $\dim_R M < d$. \square

Next we give a somewhat “general” example.

4.2 Example. Let M be a finitely generated R -module. If M^{\dagger} is maximal CM, then the identity homomorphism $\pi = 1_{M^{\dagger}}: M^{\dagger} \rightarrow M^{\dagger}$ is an MCM-cover of M^{\dagger} . The proof of Theorem A shows that the homomorphism $\mu = \pi^{\dagger} \delta_M = \delta_M$, i.e. the biduality homomorphism $\delta_M: M \rightarrow M^{\dagger \dagger}$, is an MCM-envelope M .

Here is a concrete application of the example above.

4.3 Example. Let M be a submodule of a maximal CM R -module X with the property that $\dim_R(X/M) < d - 1$. For example, $M = \mathfrak{a}$ could be an ideal in $X = R$ with $\text{height}_R(\mathfrak{a}) > 1$; see [3, Cor. 2.1.4]. Or M could be the submodule $M = (f_1, f_2, \dots)X$ where f_1, f_2, \dots is an X -regular sequence of length at least two. We claim that, in this case, the inclusion map $\iota: M \hookrightarrow X$ is an MCM-envelope of M .

To see why, apply the functor $(-)^{\dagger}$ to the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\iota} X \rightarrow X/M \rightarrow 0$ to get the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (X/M)^{\dagger} \longrightarrow X^{\dagger} \xrightarrow{\iota^{\dagger}} M^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(X/M, \Omega) .$$

Since $d - \dim_R(X/M) > 1$ it follows from [3, Cor. 3.5.11(a)] that $\text{Hom}_R(X/M, \Omega) = 0$ and $\text{Ext}_R^1(X/M, \Omega) = 0$. Hence the sequence displayed above shows that ι^{\dagger} is an isomorphism and, in particular, $M^{\dagger} \cong X^{\dagger}$ is maximal CM. Thus Example 4.2 shows that the biduality homomorphism $\delta_M: M \rightarrow M^{\dagger\dagger}$ is an MCM-envelope of M . It remains to argue that δ_M can be identified with $\iota: M \hookrightarrow X$; however, this follows from the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\iota} & X \\ \delta_M \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \delta_X \\ M^{\dagger\dagger} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\iota^{\dagger\dagger}} & X^{\dagger\dagger} \end{array}$$

Indeed, δ_X is an isomorphism as $X \in \text{MCM}$, and $\iota^{\dagger\dagger} = (\iota^{\dagger})^{\dagger}$ is an isomorphism as ι^{\dagger} is so.

4.4 Remark. For a special MCM-precover $\pi: X \rightarrow M$ of a finitely generated module M , the kernel $\text{Ker } \pi$ has finite injective dimension, and hence one has $\text{Ext}_R^i(X, \text{Ker } \pi) = 0$ for every $X \in \text{MCM}$ and every $i > 0$ — not just for $i = 1$. A similar phenomenon does not occur for special MCM-preenvelopes. Indeed, if in Example 4.3 one has e.g. $\dim_R(X/M) = d - 2$, then $\text{Coker } \iota = X/M$ satisfies $\text{Ext}_R^2(X/M, \Omega) \neq 0$ by [3, Cor. 3.5.11(b)].

5. MCM-ENVELOPES WITH THE UNIQUE LIFTING PROPERTY

If $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ is an MCM-preenvelope of a finitely generated R -module M , then the induced homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, Y): \text{Hom}_R(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, Y)$ is surjective for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$; see Definition 2.2. If $\text{Hom}_R(\mu, Y)$ is an isomorphism for every $Y \in \text{MCM}$, then we say that the MCM-preenvelope μ has the *unique lifting property*. Indeed, in this case, there exists for every homomorphism $\nu: M \rightarrow Y$ with $Y \in \text{MCM}$ a unique homomorphism $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X \\ \nu \downarrow & \nearrow \varphi & \\ Y & & \end{array}$$

Note that an MCM-preenvelope $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ with the unique lifting property must necessarily be an MCM-envelope. Indeed, the only endomorphism φ of X with $\varphi\mu = \mu$ is $\varphi = 1_X$.

5.1 Lemma. *For any finitely generated R -module M , one has $\text{depth}_R(M^{\dagger}) \geq \min\{d, 2\}$.*

Proof. Take an exact sequence $L_1 \rightarrow L_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ where L_0 and L_1 are finitely generated and free. Since the functor $(-)^{\dagger} = \text{Hom}_R(-, \Omega)$ is left exact, we get an exact sequence, $0 \rightarrow M^{\dagger} \rightarrow L_0^{\dagger} \rightarrow L_1^{\dagger} \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, where C is the cokernel of the homomorphism $L_0^{\dagger} \rightarrow L_1^{\dagger}$. Since the modules L_0^{\dagger} and L_1^{\dagger} are maximal CM, Lemma 2.4 yields

$$\text{depth}_R(M^{\dagger}) \geq \min\{d, \text{depth}_R C + 2\} \geq \min\{d, 2\} . \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem B. (i) \implies (ii): Consider an exact sequence of finitely generated modules

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow L_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} L_0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0,$$

where L_0 and L_1 are free and $K = \text{Ker } \alpha$. From [3, Prop. 1.2.9] (last inequality) one gets

$$(*) \quad \text{depth}_R N \geq \text{depth}_R K - 2.$$

Set $C = \text{Coker}(\alpha^\dagger)$ and consider the exact sequence $L_0^\dagger \xrightarrow{\alpha^\dagger} L_1^\dagger \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$. As the functor $(-)^{\dagger\dagger}$ is left exact, we get a commutative diagram with exact rows,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & L_0 \\ & & & & \downarrow \cong \delta_{L_1} & & \downarrow \cong \delta_{L_0} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\dagger & \longrightarrow & L_1^{\dagger\dagger} & \xrightarrow{\alpha^{\dagger\dagger}} & L_0^{\dagger\dagger} \end{array}$$

which shows that $K \cong C^\dagger$, since δ_{L_0} and δ_{L_1} are isomorphisms. By the assumption (i), the module K is therefore maximal CM, and hence the inequality $(*)$ yields $\text{depth}_R N \geq d - 2$. As this holds for every finitely generated R -module N , it holds in particular for the residue field $N = k$. We get $0 = \text{depth}_R k \geq d - 2$, and thus $d \leq 2$.

(ii) \implies (iii): If $d \leq 2$, then Lemma 5.1 shows that for every finitely generated R -module M , the module M^\dagger is maximal CM, and hence so is $M^{\dagger\dagger}$. Thus $F = (-)^{\dagger\dagger}$ is a functor $\text{mod} \rightarrow \text{MCM}$, which we claim is a left adjoint of the inclusion $G: \text{MCM} \rightarrow \text{mod}$. For each finitely generated R -module M and each maximal CM R -module X , the homomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_R(FM, X) = \text{Hom}_R(M^{\dagger\dagger}, X) \xrightarrow{\varphi_{M,X} = \text{Hom}_R(\delta_M, X)} \text{Hom}_R(M, X) = \text{Hom}_R(M, GX)$$

is evidently natural in M and X ; and it is surjective since the biduality map $\delta_M: M \rightarrow M^{\dagger\dagger}$ is an MCM-preenvelope of M by Example 4.2. It remains to see that $\text{Hom}_R(\delta_M, X)$ is injective. To this end, let $\mu: M^{\dagger\dagger} \rightarrow X$ be a homomorphism with $\mu\delta_M = \text{Hom}_R(\delta_M, X)(\mu) = 0$. It follows that $\delta_M^\dagger \mu^\dagger = (\mu\delta_M)^\dagger = 0$. As M^\dagger is maximal CM, the biduality map δ_{M^\dagger} is an isomorphism, and hence so is δ_M^\dagger by Lemma 3.1. Since $\delta_M^\dagger \mu^\dagger = 0$ we conclude that $\mu^\dagger = 0$. Thus $\mu^{\dagger\dagger} = (\mu^\dagger)^\dagger = 0$ and consequently $\mu = \delta_X^{-1} \mu^{\dagger\dagger} \delta_{M^{\dagger\dagger}} = 0$, as desired.

(iii) \implies (iv): Let $F: \text{mod} \rightarrow \text{MCM}$ be a left adjoint of the inclusion $G: \text{MCM} \rightarrow \text{mod}$. For every finitely generated R -module M , the unit of adjunction $\eta_M: M \rightarrow GFM$ induces, for every maximal CM R -module Y , an isomorphism:

$$\varphi_{M,Y}: \text{Hom}_R(FM, Y) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_R(M, GY) \quad \text{given by} \quad \alpha \mapsto G(\alpha)\eta_M;$$

see [12, IV.1 Thm. 1]. If we suppress the inclusion functor G and set $X = GFM = FM$, which is maximal CM by the assumption on F , we see that unit of adjunction $\eta_M: M \rightarrow X$ has the property that the map

$$\text{Hom}_R(X, Y) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_R(M, Y) \quad \text{given by} \quad \alpha \mapsto \alpha\eta_M = \text{Hom}_R(\eta_M, Y)(\alpha)$$

is an isomorphism. Thus, η_M is an MCM-envelope of M with the unique lifting property.

(iv) \implies (i): Let M be a finitely generated R -module. By assumption, M has an MCM-envelope $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ with the unique lifting property. Since Ω is maximal CM, the homomorphism $\mu^\dagger: X^\dagger \rightarrow M^\dagger$ is an isomorphism, and as X^\dagger is maximal CM, so is M^\dagger . \square

6. COSYZYGIES WITH RESPECT TO MCM

Let \mathcal{A} be a full subcategory of an abelian category \mathcal{M} (for example, $\mathcal{M} = \text{mod}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \text{MCM}$).

Assume that every object in \mathcal{M} has an \mathcal{A} -precover. In this case, every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ admits a *proper \mathcal{A} -resolution* i.e. a, not necessarily exact, complex $\mathbb{A} = \cdots \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ such that the sequence $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(A, \mathbb{A})$ is exact for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Such a resolution is constructed recursively as follows: Take an \mathcal{A} -precover $\pi_0: A_0 \rightarrow M$ of M and set $K_1 = \text{Ker } \pi_0$; take an \mathcal{A} -precover $\pi_1: A_1 \rightarrow K_1$ of K_1 and set $K_2 = \text{Ker } \pi_1$; etc. The object K_n is denoted by $\text{Syz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ and it is called the *n^{th} syzygy of M with respect to \mathcal{A}* . A given object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ has, typically, many different \mathcal{A} -precovers and proper \mathcal{A} -resolutions, so $\text{Syz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is not uniquely determined by M ; but it almost is: The version of Schanuel's lemma found in [8, Lem. 2.2] shows that if K_n and \bar{K}_n are both n^{th} syzygies of M with respect to \mathcal{A} , then there exist $A, \bar{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $K_n \oplus \bar{A} \cong \bar{K}_n \oplus A$. In particular, if \mathcal{A} is closed under direct summands (as is the case if $\mathcal{A} = \text{MCM}$), then K_n belongs to \mathcal{A} if and only if \bar{K}_n belongs to \mathcal{A} ; and thus it makes sense to ask if $\text{Syz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ belongs to \mathcal{A} .

If every object in \mathcal{M} admits an \mathcal{A} -cover, then π_0, π_1, \dots in the construction above can be chosen to be \mathcal{A} -covers, and the resulting proper \mathcal{A} -resolution is then called a *minimal proper \mathcal{A} -resolution* of M . In this case, K_n is called the *minimal n^{th} syzygy of M with respect to \mathcal{A}* , and it is denoted by $\text{syz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ (small “s” instead of capital “S”). Since an \mathcal{A} -cover (of a given object in \mathcal{M}) is unique up to isomorphism, see Xu [16, Thm. 1.2.6], the object $\text{syz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is uniquely determined, up to isomorphism, by M .

Dually, if every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ has an \mathcal{A} -preenvelope (respectively, \mathcal{A} -envelope), then a *proper \mathcal{A} -coresolution* (respectively, *minimal proper \mathcal{A} -coresolution*) $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow A^0 \rightarrow A^1 \rightarrow \cdots$ can always be constructed as follows: Take an \mathcal{A} -preenvelope (respectively, \mathcal{A} -envelope) $\mu^0: M \rightarrow A^0$ of M and set $C^1 = \text{Coker } \mu^0$; take an \mathcal{A} -preenvelope (respectively, \mathcal{A} -envelope) $\mu^1: C^1 \rightarrow A^1$ of C^1 and set $C^2 = \text{Coker } \mu^1$; etc. The object C^n is called the *n^{th} cosyzygy of M with respect to \mathcal{A}* (respectively, the *minimal n^{th} cosyzygy of M with respect to \mathcal{A}*) and it is denoted by $\text{Cosyz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ (respectively, $\text{cosyz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$). The object $\text{cosyz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is uniquely determined, up to isomorphism, by M . The object $\text{Cosyz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is almost uniquely determined by M in the sense that if C^n and \bar{C}^n are both n^{th} cosyzygies of M with respect to \mathcal{A} , then there exist $A, \bar{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $C^n \oplus \bar{A} \cong \bar{C}^n \oplus A$. Thus, if \mathcal{A} is closed under direct summands, then it makes sense to ask if $\text{Cosyz}_n^{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ belongs to \mathcal{A} .

We supplement the definitions above by setting $\text{Syz}_0^{\mathcal{A}}(M) = \text{syz}_0^{\mathcal{A}}(M) = M$, and similarly $\text{Cosyz}_0^{\mathcal{A}}(M) = \text{cosyz}_0^{\mathcal{A}}(M) = M$.

6.1 Example. Let (A, n, ℓ) be any local ring and let \mathcal{F} be the class of finitely generated free A -modules. Every finitely generated A -module M has an \mathcal{F} -cover; to construct it one takes a minimal set x_1, \dots, x_b of generators of M (here $b = \beta_0^A(M)$ is the zero'th Betti number of M) and then defines $A^b \twoheadrightarrow M$ by $e_i \mapsto x_i$; see [7, Thm. 5.3.3]. A minimal proper \mathcal{F} -resolution $\cdots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ of a finitely generated A -module M is nothing but a *minimal free resolution* of M in the classical sense, that is, where each homomorphism $F_n \rightarrow F_{n-1}$ becomes zero when tensored with the residue field ℓ of A .

6.2 Proposition. *Let M be a finitely generated R -module such that M^\dagger is maximal CM. Then the second cosyzygy, $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^2(M)$, of M with respect to MCM is maximal CM.*

Proof. By Example 4.2 the biduality homomorphism $\delta_M: M \rightarrow M^{\dagger\dagger}$ is an MCM-envelope of M . Set $C^1 = \text{cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^1(M) = \text{Coker } \delta_M$. The exact sequence $M \xrightarrow{\delta_M} M^{\dagger\dagger} \rightarrow C^1 \rightarrow 0$

induces, by application of the left exact functor $(-)^{\dagger}$, an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (C^1)^{\dagger} \longrightarrow M^{\dagger\dagger\dagger} \xrightarrow{\delta_M^{\dagger}} M^{\dagger}.$$

As M^{\dagger} is maximal CM, the biduality homomorphism $\delta_{M^{\dagger}}$ is an isomorphism, and hence so is δ_M^{\dagger} by Lemma 3.1. It follows that $\text{Hom}_R(C^1, \Omega) = (C^1)^{\dagger} = 0$, so [3, Cor. 3.5.11(b)] implies that $\dim_R(C^1) < d$. Thus Proposition 4.1 shows that $C^1 \rightarrow 0$ is an MCM-envelope of C^1 , and therefore the minimal second cosyzygy of M with respect to MCM is zero:

$$\text{cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^2(M) = \text{cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^1(C^1) = \text{Coker}(C^1 \rightarrow 0) = 0.$$

Hence any second cosyzygy of M with respect to MCM must be maximal CM. \square

We now prove Theorem C from the Introduction.

Proof of Theorem C. First note, that if X is a maximal CM R -module, then $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^i(X)$ is clearly maximal CM for every $i \geq 0$. If $n \geq d$, then the n^{th} cosyzygy of M is an $(n-d)^{\text{th}}$ cosyzygy of $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^d(M)$, that is,

$$\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^n(M) = \text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^{n-d}(\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^d(M));$$

so it suffices to argue that $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^d(M)$ is maximal CM.

If $d = 0$, then certainly $\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^0(M) = M$ is maximal CM, since every finitely generated R -module is maximal CM over an artinian ring.

Assume that $d = 1$. By Theorem A we can take a special MCM-preenvelope $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ of M . We must show that $C^1 = \text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^1(M) = \text{Coker } \mu$ is maximal CM. By definition, we have $\text{Ext}_R^1(C^1, Y) = 0$ for all $Y \in \text{MCM}$, in particular, $\text{Ext}_R^1(C^1, \Omega) = 0$. Since Ω has injective dimension $d = 1$, we also have $\text{Ext}_R^i(-, \Omega) = 0$ for all $i > 1$, and consequently, $\text{Ext}_R^i(C^1, \Omega) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Thus C^1 is maximal CM.

Finally, assume that $d \geq 2$. Let $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow X^0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X^{d-3} \rightarrow C^{d-2} \rightarrow 0$ be part of a proper MCM-coresolution of M , where $C^{d-2} = \text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^{d-2}(M)$. In the case $d = 2$, this just means that we consider the module $C^0 = \text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^0(M) = M$. Since the module Ω is maximal CM, the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (C^{d-2})^{\dagger} \longrightarrow (X^{d-3})^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow (X^0)^{\dagger} \longrightarrow M^{\dagger} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. Now Lemmas 2.4 and 5.1 yield $\text{depth}_R(C^{d-2})^{\dagger} \geq \min\{d, \text{depth}_R M^{\dagger} + d - 2\} = d$, so $(C^{d-2})^{\dagger} = (\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^{d-2}(M))^{\dagger}$ is maximal CM. Proposition 6.2 now yield that

$$\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^d(M) = \text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^2(\text{Cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^{d-2}(M))$$

is maximal CM, as desired. \square

Dutta [6] shows that if R is not regular, then no syzygy in the minimal free resolution of the residue field k (see Example 6.1) can contain a non-zero free direct summand. The following result has the same flavour, but its proof is easy. Actually, the proof of [14, Prop. 2.6] applies to prove Proposition 6.3 as well, but since it is so short, we repeat it here.

6.3 Proposition. *Assume that every finitely generated R -module has an MCM-envelope (by Theorem A, this is the case if R is henselian). Let M be a finitely generated R -module and let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. The minimal n^{th} cosyzygy, $\text{cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^n(M)$, of M with respect to MCM contains no non-zero free direct summand.*

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $n = 1$. Let $\mu: M \rightarrow X$ be an MCM-envelope of M , set $C = \text{cosyz}_{\text{MCM}}^1(M) = \text{Coker } \mu$, and write $\pi: X \twoheadrightarrow C$ for the canonical homomorphism. Let F be a free direct summand in C and denote by $\rho: C \twoheadrightarrow F$ the projection onto this direct summand. We have a commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & \downarrow \mu_0 & \parallel & & \downarrow \rho & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{\iota} & X & \xrightarrow{\rho\pi} & F \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where $\iota: K \rightarrow X$ is the kernel of $\rho\pi$, and μ_0 is the corestriction of μ to K . Since F is free, the lower short exact sequence splits, so ι has a left inverse $\sigma: X \rightarrow K$. The endomorphism $\iota\sigma$ of X satisfies $\iota\sigma\mu = \iota\sigma\iota\mu_0 = \iota\mu_0 = \mu$, and since μ is an envelope, we conclude that $\iota\sigma$ is an automorphism. In particular, ι is surjective, and hence F is zero. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Maurice Auslander and Ragnar-Olaf Buchweitz, *The homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations*, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.) (1989), no. 38, 5–37, Colloque en l'honneur de Pierre Samuel (Orsay, 1987). MR1044344
- [2] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten, *Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories*, Adv. Math. **86** (1991), no. 1, 111–152. MR1097029
- [3] Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR1251956
- [4] Lars Winther Christensen, *Gorenstein dimensions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1747, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. MR1799866
- [5] William Crawley-Boevey, *Locally finitely presented additive categories*, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), no. 5, 1641–1674. MR1264733
- [6] Sankar Prasad Dutta, *Syzygies and homological conjectures*, Commutative algebra (Berkeley, CA, 1987), Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 15, Springer, New York, 1989, pp. 139–156. MR1015516
- [7] Edgar E. Enochs and Overtoun M. G. Jenda, *Relative homological algebra*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 30, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2000. MR1753146
- [8] Edgar E. Enochs, Overtoun M. G. Jenda, and Luis Oyonarte, *λ and μ -dimensions of modules*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova **105** (2001), 111–123. MR1834984
- [9] Henrik Holm, *The structure of balanced big cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings*, preprint, 2014, arXiv:1408.5152v1 [math.AC].
- [10] Henrik Holm and Peter Jørgensen, *Rings without a Gorenstein analogue of the Govorov-Lazard theorem*, Q. J. Math. **62** (2011), no. 4, 977–988. MR2853225
- [11] Friedrich Ischebeck, *Eine Dualität zwischen den Funktoren Ext und Tor*, J. Algebra **11** (1969), 510–531. MR0237613
- [12] Saunders MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5. MR0354798
- [13] Ryo Takahashi, *On the category of modules of Gorenstein dimension zero*, Math. Z. **251** (2005), no. 2, 249–256. MR2191025
- [14] ———, *Remarks on modules approximated by G-projective modules*, J. Algebra **301** (2006), no. 2, 748–780. MR2236766
- [15] Takayoshi Wakamatsu, *On modules with trivial self-extensions*, J. Algebra **114** (1988), no. 1, 106–114. MR931903
- [16] Jinzhong Xu, *Flat covers of modules*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1634, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. MR1438789
- [17] Yuji Yoshino, *Cohen-Macaulay approximations* (Japanese), Proceedings of the 4th Symposium on Representation Theory of Algebras, Izu, Japan, 1993, pp. 119–138.

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, 2100 COPENHAGEN Ø, DENMARK

E-mail address: holm@math.ku.dk

URL: <http://www.math.ku.dk/~holm/>